

SECTION II—REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application for the following reasons:

Allowable subject matter

Applicants acknowledge that claim 13 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have incorporated the allowable subject matter from dependent claim 13 into independent claim 11.

For example, independent claim 11 now recites in pertinent part:

A method within a switch for performing one or more packet modification operations on a packet received at the switch, wherein the method comprises: **associating a data structure link with the packet received at the switch by inserting a data structure index corresponding to the data structure link into a header of the packet**

The bolded portion of the above claim is based upon the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 13, and intervening claim 12.

Applicants have further incorporated similar subject matter into independent claims 1 and 24, and have additionally aligned the scope of independent claims 1 and 24 to reflect limitations similar in scope to those of independent claim 11.

For example, independent claim 1 now recites in pertinent part:

A processor readable medium having instructions stored thereon that, when executed by a processor in a switch, cause the switch to perform a method for implementing one or more packet modification operations on a packet received at the switch, wherein the method comprises: **associating a data structure link with the packet received at the switch by inserting a data structure index corresponding to the data structure link into a header of the packet**

Independent claim 24 has been amended herein to recite in pertinent part:

A packet modification system comprising: **an associator to associate a data structure link with a packet received at the packet modification system by inserting a data structure index corresponding to the data structure link into a header of the packet**

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance as each independent claim incorporates the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 13 and other limitations similar to independent claim 11, the parent claim of allowable dependent claim 13.

Dependent claim 13 is canceled herein, and thus, the objection to the claim is now moot.

Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 6-8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18-20, 24, 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,710,923 to Jennings et al. (“Jennings”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,881 to York (“York”) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0204840 to Wu (“Wu”).

The Office Action further rejected claims 9 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jennings, York and Wu, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,943,493 to Teich et al. (“Teich”).

The Office Action further rejected claims 10 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jennings, York and Wu, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,367,650 to Sharangpani et al. (“Sharangpani”).

Lastly, the Office Action rejected claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jennings, York and Wu, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,524,258 to Corby, Jr. et al. (“Corby”).

The Office Action, at page 16, second to last paragraph, states claim 13 is “objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.”

Applicants have incorporated the subject matter of dependent claim 13 and intervening claim 12 into independent claim 11, and thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 11 is patentable over the above cited references and in condition for allowance, whether such references are considered individually or in any combination.

More particularly, none of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose:

... associating a data structure link with the packet received at the switch by inserting a data structure index corresponding to the data structure link into a header of the packet ...

Applicants further submit that independent claims 1 and 24, which recite similar limitations to those of independent claim 11, as well as those claims which depend directly or indirectly upon independent claims 1, 11, and 24, and are patentable over the above cited references and in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to the claim under 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

Given the above amendments and accompanying remarks, all claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance. If the undersigned attorney has overlooked subject matter in any of the cited references that is relevant to allowance of the claims, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such subject matter may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (503) 439-8778.

Charge Deposit Account

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fee(s) that may be due in this matter, and please credit the same deposit account for any overpayment.

Respectfully Submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

/Vincent H. Anderson/

Vincent H. Anderson
Registration No. 54,962
Attorney for Applicants

March 3, 2010

Date

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
Telephone: (503) 439-8778
Facsimile: (503) 439-6073